

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It appears from PAIR that amendments and remarks made in the PCT phase of this application were not entered, and so they are being included as attachments along with this response. To the extent that they need to be re-submitted in order to be considered, please consider this a request to amend this case as instructed in these documents.

The above re-listing of the claims is provided as a convenience to the Examiner, but have not been changed since from the amendments submitted under Article 34 in the PCT phase.

As explained in the remarks accompanying the Article 34 amendments, it is believed the art cited by the Examiner (US5,494,965 to Harlin et al) is not relevant, as it does not disclose the specific ranges in the present claims, nor suggest any advantage for choosing to limit the broad ranges disclosed to narrow ranges which Harlan itself states are non-preferred. Note in paragraph 6 of the office action, that the Examiner's statement that Harlin teaches Mw/Mn ("MWD") within the range of 2.5-9 is incomplete. Harlin teaches that only the *low* molecular weight portion of its at least two polymer component system has such an MWD. The high molecular weight portion in Harlin is, in fact, indicated as having an MWD of from 4.5 to 9.5 (see column 4, line 35). Thus for this parameter, not only is the specific range not suggested, but in fact there is not even any overlap.

In addition to the art cited in the PCT phase, the Examiner has raised US 4,536,550 to Moriguchi as relevant prior art. Like Harlin, Moriguchi does not teach or suggest the specific ranges recited in the claims. First of all the molecular weight values stated in Moriguchi are based on intrinsic viscosity measurement and not GPC data as required by the claims. More importantly however, the present claims recite specific limitations which are not met by overlapping ranges. For example "equal to or less than 10,000" is not anticipated by "molecular weight from 5,000 to 90,000", as the vast majority of this range will fall outside the scope of the presnt claims. Notably, none of the Examples contained any component with a molecular weight less than 10,000. Similarly, in claim 5, "equal or greater than 1,000,000" is not anticipated by "100,000 to 1,500,000" as a vast majority of the range is outside the scope of the

claims. This is particularly true when the preferred range is stated to be less than 1,000,000 (see col. 3, line 21) and no example has a component higher than 700,000.

Furthermore, not only is this not anticipation, but clearly there is no suggestion to pick outside the scope of the preferred ranges in Moriguchi, and no hint of the combination identified in the present application of good processability with good water vapor transmission rate.

Accordingly, as the art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, a notice of allowance of the amended claims is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/James T. Hoppe/
Registration No. 35,899
Phone: 979-238-9039

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

JTH/smm